UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,590	05/12/2006	Philippe Troplin	032475-041	9862
	7590 02/18/201 OCIATES LLC	EXAMINER		
75 MAIN STRI	EET , SUITE 301		KRAUSE, ANDREW E	
MILLBURN, NJ 07041			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/561,590	TROPLIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	ANDREW KRAUSE	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	**	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	-	imaly filed emendmen	ot concoling the
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owabie ii subifilited iii a separate, t	imely filed afficilities	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-14 and 17-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Keith D. Hendricks/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794	/ANDREW KRAUSE/ Examiner, Art Unit 1794		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 13 is amended to correct a typographical error. The present rejections are maintained for the reasons of record.

Applicant alleges that Halliday does not qualify as prior art. However Halliday qualifies as prior art based on its priority claim to 60/462,538, filed 4/11/03, which antedates applicants foreign priority date. In response to applicant's statement, "Applicants do not concede use of a provisional application filing date to establish priority over claims is permissible," applicant's attention is directed to MPEP 2136.03, which states, "The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) critical reference date of a U.S. patent or U.S. application publications and certain international application publications entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a provisional application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is the filing date of the provisional application with certain exceptions if the provisional application(s) properly supports the subject matter relied upon to make the rejection in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. " 60/462,538 clearly supports Halliday (Col.12, lines 60-65) at page 1093, lines 15-23.

With respect to the contention that Rusoff teaches away from the claimed combination, it is noted that a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. The passage cited from Rusoff, indicating that it may be desirable to avoid the presence of cocoa solids in the Rusoff extract is not seen to "clearly teach away from adding cocao powder to its cacao flavoring composition" but rather suggests the inclusion of cacao solids may not be most preferred.